

Date: Tue, 3 Aug 93 04:30:12 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #281
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Tue, 3 Aug 93 Volume 93 : Issue 281

Today's Topics:

Code/NoCode
Code vs. No Code
Lead the Way! (was Re: code/nocode blah blah blah
Real CBers

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available (by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 2 Aug 93 16:54:18 GMT
From: usc!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!spool.mu.edu!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!
news.ecn.bgu.edu!psuvax1!vogon1!wa3wbu!frackit!ka3uzr!daveh@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Code/NoCode
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Rev. Michael P. Deignan) writes:

> ak842@cleveland.Freenet.Edu (Douglas Dever) writes:
>
> >In fact, if the
> >no-code license hadn't brought more people like me into the hobby,
> >how many bands do you think you'd have left.
>
> Since most of the no-clue licensees hang out exclusively on 2 meters,
> clearly the no-clue license has done little to "save our bandwidth"
> by populating those bands we were "in danger of losing" with new, no-clue
> hams. Your insinuation that without the no-clue license we would have less
> bandwidth is false.

>
Hey Rev, how about dropping the derogatory "no-clue" epithet. The proper license class is technician, but use no-code Technician if you have to distinguish them from the Technicians who have passed a CW test.

Insulting these people doesn't help ham radio in any way. It may make you feel smug and superior, but I find it offensive. We should be welcoming all new hams, not alienating them!

>
> In this area, ARES is a joke. The section Emergency Coordinator rarely
> shows up for the statewide ARES net. Nobody has a clue as to what is
> going on. The last ARES net had two net-controls on the same
> repeater (when I asked "why", I was told "so someone who can't hear
> our net-control-south might be able to hear our net-control-north".
> Duhhh... McFly! Get a clue. Its a damn *repeater*. It has a defined
> coverage area. Everyone will be able to hear n-c-south.)

>
> I am very good friends with several law enforcement officials, many
> involved with disaster relief. Their opinion of ham-radio emergency
> services is all the same: its a waste. In fact, many believe that
> hams actually create *more* work for them, because with a bunch of
> untrained, i-think-i'm-so-important buffoons running around a
> disaster site, all they do is at the minimum get in the way of real
> disaster crews doing their job, and at the maximum end up getting
> themselves hurt or killed.

>
> And, I won't even *begin* to tell you the story about the no-clue
> who volunteered for the ARES position of Kent County DEC and now
> drives around in a circa-1974 Ford Pinto with, yes, you guessed
> it, a bar of flashing lights on the roof. Can you say "police
> authority wannabe?" Good, I knew you could. (Ever wonder what the
> local authorities think when he shows up? I'll tell you: They
> chuckle. He's the laughing stock.)

>
So what? All this proves is that there are jerks among the new licensees just as there are among the OFs. License class and morse code tests have absolutely no bearing on whether someone is going to act like a jerk.

All you have to do is review QST, CQ, 73, etc. issues since the no-code license was approved. The people getting the fines, license suspensions, etc. are almost exclusively those

who passed a code test. In fact the number of 20wpm Extras that the FCC has nailed in the last two years leads me to believe that a morse code exam tests nothing, but the ability to copy morse code, PERIOD!

Dave Hultberg KA3UZR | vogon1!compnct!frackit!ka3uзд!daveh@psuvax1.psu.edu
Fidonet: 1:270/101.28 | Assistant Scoutmaster, Troop 196, Keystone Area Council

Brotherhood Member Susquehannock Lodge 11 \/\ \/\ \/\ \/\ | ASTA

Date: Tue, 3 Aug 1993 08:26:13 UTC
From: pipex!uknet!mcsun!news.eunet.fi!anon.penet.fi@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Code vs. No Code
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I really everyone would get a life and get off this subject and realize that we are all amateur radio operators who have something to give. If we keep breaking up into little groups, then this hobby is not long for this country.

To find out more about the anon service, send mail to help@anon.penet.fi. Due to the double-blind, any mail replies to this message will be anonymized, and an anonymous id will be allocated automatically. You have been warned. Please report any problems, inappropriate use etc. to admin@anon.penet.fi.

Date: Tue, 3 Aug 1993 01:52:35 GMT
From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!usc!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!news.dtc.hp.com!
srgenprp!alanb@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Lead the Way! (was Re: code/nocode blah blah blah
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

nuts2u::little (little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com) wrote:
: Why *is* the question pool published? ...

I think the reason is that, way back when, Dick Bash and others were already compiling and selling the "secret" question pools. By making the questions available officially, it no longer gave the advantage to those willing to "cheat."

: Perhaps a better option is to try and make the pool large enough to make : memorizing the questions self defeating. ...

I think that was the original objective. Unfortunately, it takes time and energy on the FCC's part to review and maintain the question pools, with the result that (IMHO) the number of questions is marginal.

AL N1AL

Date: 2 Aug 93 17:12:26 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!news.ecn.bgu.edu!

psuvax1!vogon1!wa3wbu!frackit!ka3uzr!daveh@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Real CBers
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

system@garlic.sbs.com (Tony Pelliccio) writes:

>
> The problem with this is that you get people who came in under the
> no-code license, then scream because they want HF access without any
> additional effort. Hence, clueless. :)

Ah, I see, lets through out the no-code license because some of them offend your sensabilities. Give me a break Tony. You are going to hurt yourself jumping to conclusions. Because some no-code Techs (percentage unknown) have starting asking for HF priviledges, you conclude that they are all (or at least a majority are) "no-clues". Maybe we should brand all Extras with the same sort of term for the actions of Herbie, the 14.313 gang, etc.? Why don't you take all the energy your wasting her pissing and moaning and file your request with the FCC. If there are en enough hams out there who share your views, you might even get what you want. Or do you just like to hear yourself bitch?

Dave Hultberg KA3UZR | vogon1!compnect!frackit!ka3uzr!daveh@psuvax1.psu.edu
Fidonet: 1:270/101.28 | Assistant Scoutmaster, Troop 196, Keystone Area Council

Brotherhood Member Susquehannock Lodge 11 \/\| \/\| \/\| | ASTA

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #281
